



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

50c a Year
Devoted to the
High-School-College
Entrance
Scholarship Fund

THE NEW YORK LATIN LEAFLET

Entered at the Post Office in Brooklyn as second-class matter, October 29, 1900

25 Issues
One-half of
Every Subscription
goes into the
Scholarship Fund

VOL VII

BROOKLYN, NEW YORK, MARCH 18, 1907

No 169

ON SOME RECENT PUBLICATIONS OF PROFESSOR HALE

1 An Unrecognized Construction of The Latin Subjunctive (Class Phil I 1).

Professor Hale's purpose in this paper is to establish as a distinct subjunctive category the use of the Present Subjunctive Second Singular Indefinite, to express general statements of fact, in main clauses as well as in dependent ones.

He has collected, first of all, a large number of examples in which an indefinite second singular of this subjunctive is found in main clauses. This list he gives (pp 29-32) with as much of the context as may assist in determining this meaning. Examining the passages in the light of the various explanations given by grammars and commentaries, it becomes evident that no one explanation will fit them all, and all explanations taken together will give no adequate account of many of the citations; except by a Procrustean process which is, at best, an excuse for failing to explain, not an explanation.

As specimens of the list, the following will suffice:

Hor Sat I 1 61 Nil satis est, inquit, quia tanti quantum habeas, sis.

Petron 77 Assem habeas, assem valeas.

Sall Cat 52 29 Ubi socordiae te atque ignaviae tradideris, nequiquam deos implores.

With the ground cleared, Professor Hale attacks his constructive problem—1st, by ascertaining the natural and obvious meaning, which in all these cases is that of a mere statement; 2d, by gathering a number of phrases in which similar ideas are expressed in the indicative; 3d, by examining the context.

Take, for example, the passage from Sallust (Hale 18), where the subjunctive is wedged into a series of unmistakable statements, all developing the same idea, and all in the indicative; or the passage from Petronius (Hale 31), where the second member, in the indicative, repeats in an abstract form the statement of the first member. It seems clear enough that in the course of four lines Sallust has not jumped from the mental attitude of dry assertion of facts to that involved in anticipating, wishing, permitting—and back again. Many other of the examples are treated ordinarily in an equally forced and unnatural fashion. If a simple explanation is offered that will cover all the cases, and will not strain the sense, it would be unreasonable to refuse assent to it. As Professor Hale anticipated, such an explanation will afford sensible relief to teachers of Latin who have met the point in the class-room and have been driven to the more or less masterly fictions to account for it, that are discussed in this paper. The establishing of the power contended for in the second singular indefinite of the subjunctive, to express general statements of fact seems precisely such an explanation.

That a number of the instances cited may, with a certain plausibility be referred to one or another of the received categories, is true enough; but it is a sufficient answer that the majority cannot be readily so classified, and that, if that category had a place

in our grammars it would never occur to us, to place any of the examples anywhere else.

It would be profitable to go through the list and substitute in every case an indicative for the subjunctive. No general principle will be violated and no difference in meaning would be perceptible.

In his account of the origin of the construction, Professor Hale suggested that the influence of the common use of the subjunctive in the protases of conditions, brought about a similar use in the apodoses. One might go even further and assert that the use of the subjunctive in both members originated simultaneously—as indeed Note 1 on page 39 implies.

If we turn to the examples given in the grammars under "Present General Conditions", we find that they all consist of present subjunctive second singular indefinite in the protasis with some other person and number of the indicative in the apodosis, e g (Lane 2070) Cic R P I 2 Nec habere virtutem satis est, nisi utare. Now just as if the third person, in the protasis, would have been regularly indicative, while it is only the indefinite second person which is put in the subjunctive, it is very likely that the second singular indefinite, if used in the apodosis, is also regularly subjunctive. Indeed, if classifying conditions were a new field, one would expect that to be the case by analogy with the other conditions: i e, while, nec habere virtutem satis est, nisi utare is regular, and nec habere virtutem satis est, nisi utuntur ea homines is likewise regular, so nec habere virtutem nisi utare is equally regular.

We should desire a large number of instances in which an indefinite second singular is used in the protasis in the subjunctive, coupled with the same person in the indicative in the apodosis to disprove its regularity. No such instances are forthcoming. Professor Hale mentions one, Plin Ep I 8 15, while instances of what we may call the regular form are found on Nos 5 6 7 11 12 18 19 20 21 22 26 28. When we take up the sentences in which the protasis is not purely conditional, or where it is omitted or implied, Professor Hale would seem to be quite justified in asserting that his case for this category of the Subjunctive is made out.

2 An Experiment in the Teaching of First and Second Year Latin (Class Jour I 1).

The experiment of Professor Hale in actual secondary teaching cannot fail to have the utmost interest for those to whom the *Latin Leaflet* is primarily addressed. That there is a weakness in classical teaching is apparent from the vigorous discussion the subject has recently received. The dictum of Carlyle applies here, that it is not when nations are in a healthy stage of development that they are exercised over the fundamental principles of government. When one of the most distinguished of American scholars, and one of her foremost grammarians applies himself to the actual problem with which the rank and file of us are daily engaged, the results must be helpful in the highest degree.

At the very outset, Professor Hale strikes a note upon which it is difficult to dwell too long. "We who

teach languages, and especially we who teach the older languages, have a great advantage which we at present hold in much too timorous a fashion, but a noble and beautiful observational science for which any recitation room affords a laboratory. And again that which it belongs to us to profess is not only a science, but a noble and beautiful literature, which is deeply woven into the world's consciousness or sub-consciousness. Latin and Greek will never be able to defend themselves successfully until their full claims are boldly stated".

It is clear that for secondary teaching the more immediately important of the two phases of classical study is the scientific. Indeed, for the first year it can be the only phase. And it is right at this point that one finds a great weakness. We have, as Professor Hale says, no science, and that is manifested in the unscientific character of our terminology and the disagreement of our system of classification. Let any one should despise classification and terminology, it may be useful to remember that scientific Biology begins with the classification of Linnaeus, and that every important stride is measured by the improvement of the system of classification; as when, e g, Huxley and Owen broke up the "Radiate mob" of Cuvier.

Professor Hale's own classification, individual points of which he discusses here, is well-known as a whole. And whatever difference of opinion might be entertained on special matters, its very great value is acknowledged. But we are principally concerned here with his method. Dealing with a science, he attempts to gain from it the training for which all sciences are intended in secondary schools, the training of the observational faculties, which involves the training of comparison, and judgment. In Latin and Greek this is gained by educating the pupil into as accurate and precise a classification of forms as will avoid pedantry. And Professor Hale makes the practical and excellent suggestion of employing a chart, of the sort he exemplifies, and keeping continually before the pupil that synoptic tabulation of forms which alone can secure the desired effect.

Nutations in the study of the classics is a term with which Professor Gildersleeve has made us familiar. And just as the last decades may have over-emphasized syntax and accuracy of classification, the reaction is only too likely to under-emphasize it. Of the two the error of excess is likely to be less harmful than the other: that is to say, the time devoted to drill and practice in syntax, even if carried to an unnecessary extent, has the compensation of precision of mental habit; while neglect in that direction deprives the boy of his scientific training, and is not at all likely—never, in the writer's experience, to be compensated by fuller or better appreciation of the text.

The advocates of the natural sciences claim for their subject not only a formative, but a substantial value. The imparting of a body of important facts which it is desired to make a portion of the pupil's permanent intellectual possessions is a consciously pursued, and often attained, goal of their work. And it is here that the science teacher most frequently thanks God he is not as his classical colleague, whose facts, even if their training power is conceded, are of no practical importance. But the other phase of classical teaching, upon which Professor Hale lays stress, covers this point. Not merely for the training of the faculties is syntactical accuracy requisite. Without knowledge of the language's structure, any

entering into the spirit of its literature is not readily possible, and knowledge that is vague and uncertain is for such purposes not knowledge at all. Professor Hale's position becomes all the stronger when both sides of classical study are kept in mind.

It is Utopian to hope for any detailed agreement among classical scholars as to the real nature of many constructions in Latin or in Greek. But it ought not to be an unrealizable hope that an authoritative and representative body will establish a uniform terminology and classification in which substantial accuracy and general acceptance will vastly outweigh the minor discrepancies regarding which doctoral dissertations may continue to be written. It is precisely in this way that zoologists and chemists have secured uniformity of classification, although in the former case at least there is still considerable diversity of opinion on secondary points.

The value of Professor Hale's experiment consists in the redemonstration of the necessity for accuracy and precision, particularly in syntactical work, if the study of Latin is to yield the fruits which may properly be expected of it.

3 A Century of Metaphysical Syntax.

This lecture, delivered at St Louis in 1904, briefly summarizes the course of development in the treatment of moods in Latin and Greek grammar. Professor Hale shows how the metaphysical analysis of Wolff and Kant entered Greek grammar through Herrmann and that, in a higher or less degree, it has maintained itself ever since—and has been transferred to Latin and to modern languages. That is to say: the subdivisions of Kant's category of Modality: Existence, Possibility and Necessity are still used in a modified form to explain such matter-of-fact and humdrum assertions as "if I were", "so sei es", etc.

A distrust of metaphysics is too nearly instinctive with our generation to be quarrelled with. Professor Hale's insistence that the psychological method is the only one possible for modern scientific research will also scarcely be gainsaid. It may be stated in passing that as early as 1865, Goodwin (Preface to Moods and Tenses) recognized the metaphysical tendencies due to Herrmann, and made an attempt to avoid them, though, in Professor Hale's opinion, with indifferent success.

It is interesting to note that the *diathesis psychiké*, of Apollonios Dyskolos, to which definition of "mood" Professor Hale asks us to return, is not very far from the definition of Wundt in the first volume of his *Voelkerpsychologie*, part III, which deals with the phenomena of language. Wundt defines *Modus* as "Zustand des wahrnehmenden Subjects". Wundt's views on Philology, based largely on data derived from Delbrueck's Comparative Grammar, have met with rather little favor at the hands of philologists, but for a psychological treatment of these facts, the opinions of one of the greatest of psychologists must be given due weight.

M RADIN

De Witt Clinton H S

Four Important Features

The New York High School College Entrance Scholarship which is now being established is to be absolutely democratic.

1 It will be open to all New York high school graduates alike, boys or girls, on a competitive examination.

2 It will be open to all departments alike, no department ranking higher in importance than any other.

3 It will lead to all schools alike, liberal, professional or technical, within the choice of the winner.

4 It is being contributed to by all kinds of friends of education alike, without reference to politics, race or religion.